One Way to Put A Spoke in the CIA's Wheel, P. 2

So The Vietcong Are Too Strong For Us In Most of Rural South Vietnam

"The elections beginning April 2 will take place in only a third of the country's villages and a fourth of its hamlets, because the threat of Vietcong interference is too great elsewhere."

—"U.S. Aides Shifting View on Pacifying Vietnam Villages"—R. W. Apple, Jr., from Saigon: N. Y. Times *March 25.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 13 APRIL 3, 1967 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Fresh Dove That Turned Out To Be Frozen Vulture

Writing at press time, before any reply from Hanoi, it is difficult to understand U Thant's new revision of his 3-point peace proposal nor why he chose this moment to make it public. The original called for a cessation of bombing as the first step; the revised plan, for a general stand-still. This would mean that the American bombing forced the North to strain its relations with the Liberation Front by ordering a cease-fire in the South. It would also mean the threat of renewed bombardment during negotiations. This is the price, and these are the conditions, to which the North has always objected. In its view, as U Thant has himself explained, the only reciprocity for suspension of bombing the North would be a suspension of bombing the United States—if the North were able to retaliate as a major power would. Under the circumstances, it sees this as big power blackmail and it refuses to pay the price.

How Rusk Revised U Thant

The tricky use to which the U.S. at once put the new U Thant plan was evident in the press conference summoned a few hours later by Secretary of State Rusk. U Thant called for a cease-fire without supervision; he felt supervision would be impractical. His second step called for preliminary talks to reach an agreement "on the modalities for the reconvening of the Geneva conference, with *the sole purpose* [our italics] of returning to the essentials of that agreement." The U.S. note of "acceptance" proposed on the contrary preliminary talks to see "if an *effective* cessation of hostilities, *as the first element* in the 3-point proposal, could be promptly negotiated." [Our italics.] This means negotiations on the terms of a cease-fire *before* the bombing has stopped and a cessation of bombing only on conditions satisfactory to the U.S. This brings us straight back to Johnson's Feb. 2 letter to Ho, demanding assurances in advance of any bomb suspension. Even if Hanoi conceivably accepted U Thant's new proposals, it is inconceivable that it would accept Rusk's revision of them. Rusk made sure Hanoi would say no.

The reader may ask, "Didn't Hanoi say no in a broadcast the day before?" U Thant didn't think so. Neither did the State Department's spokesman at his noon briefing before Rusk met the press. McCloskey, when asked if the Hanoi broadcast constituted a rejection, declined so to characterize it. Rusk was fuzzy on the point. Curiously, the text was not in the official U.S. monitoring service that afternoon, a day after the broadcast. This service often withholds texts that run counter to U.S. propaganda purposes.

What the South Vietnamese Really Want

"New York (AP)—A survey of public opinion in South Vietnam from a population sampling the pollsters admit had to be sharply restricted, reported yesterday that 81% of those questioned want peace above all else. Only 4% listed victory over communism, 2% reunification of north and south, and 45% independence as aims preferable to a quick peace. The poll was organized by the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton and conducted by the Center for Vietnamese Studies in Saigon, for the Columbia Broadcasting System which televised them last night. CBS said it was the first independent opinion survey ever taken in South Vietnam . . . Organizers of the survey said it was held only among persons living in secured areas controlled by the allies . . . Interviewers, the organizers said, also took into account reluctance of those questioned to get themselves in trouble with the authorities."

—York, Pa. Gazette & Daily, *March 22.*

We see here the same tactic as Johnson's letter which upped the ante—as Robert Kennedy immediately noted—to make rejection certain. Clayton Fritchie in a recent column asked about the letter's timing. There is something fishy about the date. It is dated Feb. 2 but Ho says he received it Feb. 10. Pope Paul's appeal to Johnson and Ho for an extended truce was sent to Johnson Feb. 7. The Johnson letter made it possible for U.S. diplomats to inform His Holiness Feb. 8 that we were making "intensive efforts" toward that end. It served for similar assurances to buttress Harold Wilson in his talks with Kosygin Feb. 8 to 13, and enabled Wilson to tell the Commons Feb. 14 that "one small move" would have set talks in motion. Ho's broadcast March 21 and Johnson's release of his text in reply disclosed how tricky was Johnson's real offer. Under its terms Ho would have had to stop sending supplies to his comrades-in-arms, though we—while not "augmenting" the number of U.S. troops—would still be free to supply our own.

Johnson has again succeeded in getting credit for extending an olive branch, while making certain that it would be unacceptable. Mansfield, in terming Johnson's crafty welcome to U Thant's proposal an "unqualified" acceptance and calling on all war critics to rally behind him, only shows how gullible the best Senators are in Johnson's supermarket. This fresh-killed dove is only quick-frozen vulture.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foundations Would Be Afraid to Act As "Covers" If They Could Be Sued For It

Stephen Spender — One of the Deceived — Would Make CIA Lies Actionable

We hope some member of Congress concerned with the CIA scandal will act on the proposal made by Stephen Spender in a letter to the *New York Times* June 27. He suggests that people who had been assured that the organizations for which they worked were not the recipients of CIA or other secret funds be given the right to sue those who lied to them, and the foundations which acted as covers for the CIA. The distinguished British poet writes from bitter experience. For years, as an editor of *Encounter* and a travelling lecturer for the Congress of Cultural Freedom which supported it, he denied in good faith that these were secretly financed by the CIA only to learn in the end that the assurances given him by his American collaborators were false.

Better Than Occasional "Leaks"

A law allowing suit for damages to reputation in such cases would serve a double purpose. It would give individuals some protection against deception. And the trial of such suits would make it possible to put the spotlight on these arrangements far more thoroughly than can be done in occasional journalistic exposes based on random leaks from the disenchanted. All kinds of plans are afoot to substitute open foundation or other support for CIA funds. "But since there has been deception in the past," Mr. Spender writes, "what guarantee is there that the deception will not merely become more guileful, and individuals will be deceived into playing the role of deceivers"—just as he was?

The Congress of Cultural Freedom was taken over by the Ford Foundation last year after Max Frankel in the *New York Times* exposed its CIA financing. The Congress has financed a whole string of intellectual magazines in French (*Preuves*), German (*Der Monat*), Italian (*Tempi Presenti*) and Spanish (*Cuadernos*) as well as *Quest* in Bombay. These provided slick outlets for U.S. cold war propaganda, and a profitable market for intellectuals and scholars.

Encounter has a new angel. The others presumably will go on being financed by the Ford Foundation for the Congress of Cultural Freedom. Frankly we don't think the shift from CIA to Ford makes much difference. The Ford Foundation, with McGeorge Bundy at its head, like the Rockefeller Foundation, which Dean Rusk long ran, are part of the same pompous American Establishment. Rusk took his Rest and Relaxation in the Rockefeller Foundation in between his two stints in the State Department. Bundy may see the Ford Foundation as his own stepping stone from White House to State. These stuffed shirt institutions are no more likely to finance independent and critical writing on American policy in Vietnam or Latin America than would the CIA.

Congressmen Afraid to Appear on Campuses?

"A Democratic National Committee program to bring members of Congress to college campuses has run into resistance on Capitol Hill because a number of Congressmen fear such appearances . . . The 'Congress on Campus' program . . . is motivated . . . by a desire to offset the hostility . . . toward the Johnson Administration . . . One Congressman, who asked not to be identified, explained: 'I'm going to have enough trouble defending the Administration position on Vietnam when I run next year.' . . . Another Congressman, who also asked to remain anonymous, said: 'The war is unpopular enough in my district now. The last thing I need is to have a college debate reported in the local newspapers. If I accepted the invitation, I'd have to defend the administration against some irrational arguments.' He suggested he might agree to appear on a campus located somewhere distant from his congressional district so his constituents would have less chance of knowing what transpired."

—P. 1 Story: Robert Walters, Wash. Star *March 24.*

This Letter from Vietnamese Students Was Blacked Out by The U.S. Press

"We are students and professors in the universities of South Vietnam (Saigon, Hue, Dalat, Can-Tho and Van-Hanh) and we thank you for trying to stop this dreadful war in our country. We cannot act officially, as you have done, because the government does not permit our universities to express themselves freely. We have launched petitions and appeals, but we cannot allow our names to be published because we would be arrested and imprisoned. We write to thank you and to exhort you to continue. We beg you to take into consideration the following facts:

"(1) In the South Vietnamese cities, American power in support of the Ky government is so great that no one can protest the war without risking his life or liberty;

"(2) If this were not so, millions of people would raise their voices. The Vietnamese people ardently desire the end of the war, but they have lost hope. They are not Communists but if the war does not end soon they will join the National Liberation Front because they see no other way out;

"(3) The Americans should not believe they are protecting the South Vietnamese against Communism. We are persuaded for the most part that it is only to prepare a war against China that the U.S. desires to dominate our country;

"(4) The present government of South Vietnam is not our government and does not represent our people. It has been imposed upon us by the U.S. and is run by military men who fought for France against the Vietnamese before 1954. If we were allowed to vote freely, this government could not last a single day. We want a government of our own, so we can solve the problems of Vietnam ourselves on a basis of national fraternity: negotiate peace with the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam, and negotiate the withdrawal of American troops with the U.S.;

"(5) Don't believe that the danger of a Communist takeover justifies continuation of the war. We are convinced that we are strong enough to form an independent government. But it is for us, not you, to make the decisions because it is our lives and our country which are at stake;

"(6) We endorse the [peace] proposals in the book of our friend, Thich Nhat Hanh, "Vietnam: Lotus in A Sea of Fire," and ask that you help us put them into effect."

—This open letter from 70 South Vietnamese students and professors to the U.S. student movement was transmitted through the Fellowship of Reconciliation. It was offered to press, radio and TV at a New York City press conference March 20 and though every press desk to which the FOR spoke expressed interest, no one appeared. We did not learn of this extraordinary blackout until we saw the letter in Le Monde, *March 23, and queried the FOR.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Question in The Arrest of Richard Sobol, A Volunteer Lawyer, in Louisiana

Will the New Attorney General Uphold Negro Rights to Counsel in The South?

We have been favorably impressed with the debut of the new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, and look forward to seeing how he reacts in the Richard Sobol case. Sobol is one of a handful of volunteers who have gone south for the Lawyer's Constitutional Defense Committee to provide aid to Negroes and civil rights workers. Every effort is being made to drive out these young lawyers. The only such volunteer in Alabama has recently been forced out of the State. Sobol—the one volunteer working in Louisiana—has been arrested on charges of practicing law without a license. A counter-action has been filed in the Federal courts to enjoin the State prosecution. The Attorney General has authority to intervene under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is his duty to do so.

A Typical Scene in A Mixed School

At stake is not only the right to counsel, but whether the Justice Department will lend support to volunteer counsel who go south to see that government orders in civil rights cases are implemented. Sobol is a member of the U.S. Supreme Court bar and an associate on leave from the Washington firm of Arnold & Porter. His arrest grew out of a Federal court order to desegregate the schools in Plaquemines Parish, the stronghold of Leander Perez. A Negro, Gary Duncan, driving home past the desegregated schoolyard, saw two of his cousins being harassed by a group of the few white boys who still remain in the school. He picked his cousins up in his truck and rescued them. The ringleader of the white boys charged that Duncan slapped him on the elbow. Duncan claimed that he merely took him by the elbow and told him to go home. Duncan was first charged with cruelty to a juvenile. When Sobol got this charge quashed, Duncan was convicted of simple battery and sentenced to 6 months in jail and a $150 fine. In appealing this, Sobol was himself locked up.

Since July, 1966, Sobol has had the temerity to work with a Negro law firm in New Orleans. The newspapers have been full, even in that supposedly civilized community, of sensational stories about this "mix-lawyer". His work in Plaquemines County has been the first of its kind since Reconstruction.

The charge of practicing law without a license is about as flimsy as one could imagine. Louisiana law permits out-of-state counsel to appear in its courts if they do so as associates of local firms. Sobol has been working as an associate of Collins, Douglas and Elie, perhaps the only Negro firm in the State willing to represent CORE and other civil rights groups. They introduced Sobol to the court as their associate in the Duncan case. But thereafter he appeared in the proceedings alone. It is on this that the prosecution is based.

If Sobol is forced out of Louisiana, as Donald Jelinek, another LCDC volunteer recently was out of Alabama, the effect on civil rights actions, private and governmental, will be deadly. The Attorney General has the power to intervene against such frame-ups under the 1964 Act. This is a fundamental test of his mettle.

While Negro Churches Burn, FBI 'Takes Notes'

"The bombing and burning of black churches in the American South has become one of the traditional methods used by white racists . . . That this method has the approval of white America is best exemplified by the continued refusal of the Federal government, FBI and state and local police to . . . make even minimal efforts to apprehend the perpetrators . . . This past week-end saw a new outbreak of church bombings in Lowndes County, Alabama, the same 'Bloody Lowndes' where Viola Liuzzo and Rev. Jonathan Daniels were murdered. On Sunday morning, a renovated church which had been rented to the Lowndes County Christian Movement for the Anti-Poverty program, burned to the ground . . . As usual the FBI made a routine investigation and 'took notes'. The Macedonian Baptist Church in Fort Deposit, Alabama, was burned early Monday morning following a mass meeting on Sunday night for the Lowndes County Christian Movement. Whites had warned they would burn the church if it was used for such meetings. Again the FBI is making a routine investigation and is 'taking notes'."

—Stokeley Carmichael, SNCC Chairman, March 15.

The Deeper Latin American Issues Our Congressional Liberals Fail to Discuss

Three issues stand out in the fight between the Administration and Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over the resolution of support Johnson asked for the Latin American "summit" to be held at Punta del Este April 11. The first involves the President's methods in trying to stampede the Congress into a blank check of support on the basis of a big White House party—a kind of social lobby—and a few days of cursory hearings. Fulbright and a majority of his committee—except for Morse, who is supporting Johnson on this one—are leery of blank checks and resent methods which turn the Congress into a Presidential rubber stamp.

The second issue, reflected in Senator Gruening's testimony against the resolution before Fulbright's committee March 21, is whether the U.S. ought to be increasing aid to Latin America at a time when domestic aid programs are being cut back because of the war in Vietnam.

The third issue has hardly been touched on either by the liberals critical of Johnson in the Senate, or by the liberals in the House, most of whom voted for the resolution. This is whether the new conference is really oriented toward the needs of the Latin masses. We note that the main objective, the creation of a Latin common market, has the fervent support of David Rockefeller's Council for Latin America which represents 85% of U.S. investment there. We also note that even the Latin labor leaders linked with our own CIA-tainted Latin division of the AFL-CIO are protesting (N.Y. Times, Mar. 27) the irrelevance of the "summit" agenda to "unemployment, maldistribution of income and lack of basic liberties" which they call the main problems of the hemisphere. Even Senator Javits, in a plea for the common market and salvation-by-private-enterprise, wrote in Foreign Affairs (April), "It is true that the private sector in Latin America has yet to demonstrate that it can meet the material needs of the people or that it is ready to accept its obligations to society." That is quite an admission. The liberals in Congress ought to examine these basic questions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Most Papers, Including the New York Times, Ignored in His Report

Symington's Gloomy View of The Vietnamese War Unfit to Print?

While the headlines focussed on the recommendation for wider air raids on North Vietnam in Senator Symington's report (March 27) on his trip to Southeast Asia, most newspapers—including the New York Times*—omitted the gloomy assessment of the political and military outlook in the following paragraphs:*

"There is now less certainty in my mind than there was a year ago that the present government in South Vietnam speaks for a majority of the South Vietnamese people. It is clear that the current composition of the government exacerbates religious and political differences.

"Much of the victory obtained by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces in the daytime is lost at night, primarily because we do not seem to be able to obtain a handle on the problem of the guerrillas.

"During recent months the North Vietnamese have made major improvements in air defenses. Their operations are more integrated; their pilots more skilful. Many of our aircraft are now forced to jettison their ordnance off target, in order to survive MIG attacks; result, lost mission.

"The Other War" We Can't Win

"It is our understanding South Vietnam's army has been assigned primary responsibility for conducting the vital 'pacification' operations in those limited areas of their country controlled by their own army and ours. This is a job which the U.S. military, regardless of the degree of our investment, cannot do for this war-torn and harassed nation.*

"If the South Vietnamese do not achieve this pacification, there is no point in this country continuing to pour out lives and treasure in order to protect a government that can neither consolidate nor control what has been taken from them by their own citizens and the North Vietnamese.

"If the United States decides to become the major factor in this pacification program as well as in the fighting of the war, it can only become an extended war of the white man against the Asians, on the mainland of Asia. [Our italics.]

"Countries in the Middle East and Europe simply cannot understand why this nation, with a population of some 200 million people and a $750 billion gross national product, continues to have so much trouble in the conduct of a war against an underdeveloped country that has a population of some 17 million people. They continue to ask: 'What are you trying to do—what is your definition of success?'

"If political agreement or military action does not bring this South Vietnam venture to termination, and at a relatively early date, after noting again on this trip the progress in the degree of the cost involved, it is my considered opinion that unless our major domestic and international programs are substantially curtailed, the financial position of the United States will become serious indeed."

*** General Dayan and I [in Tel Aviv] discussed . . . his recent trip to Vietnam. He was emphatic that non-Vietnamese troops could never succeed as leaders of the pacification program in South Vietnam, because the villagers would not accept their recommendations."—P. 125, Symington's diary-report.**

Chalk Up A Victory—For Bubonic Plague

"As persons in the health professions, we have been especially aware of the medical aspects of the war in Vietnam. Observations of medical facilities estimate six civilian casualties for each military casualty. The majority are children. Children burned with napalm will be deformed and crippled for the rest of their lives. Yet a new and 'more adhesive' napalm is being developed. Herbicidal crop destruction is spreading disease and death from malnutrition; the elderly, children and pregnant women are its chief victims. Cholera, malaria and other diseases have ravaged large numbers of the civilian population. How can we so devastate a people whom we say we are aiding?"

—From an appeal by 6,000 doctors, nurses, health and social workers March 22 to Dr. Philip Lee, Assistant Secretary of HEW, protesting diversion of welfare funds to the war and supporting U Thant's 3-step plan to end it.

At a press conference held by the group, Dr. Jean Mayer, Harvard Prof. of Nutrition, said bubonic plague cases in South Vietnam had jumped from 8 in 1961 to 4500 in 1966 to 2500 in the first two months of this year, and that cholera cases had risen from a few hundred a year to 25,000 last year.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

4/3/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe: 20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED